

The College at Brockport: State University of New York Digital Commons @Brockport

Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation

2005

Biological Sciences: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation

The College at Brockport

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Repository Citation

The College at Brockport, "Biological Sciences: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation" (2005). *Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation*. 3.

<http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt/3>

This Document is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @Brockport. It has been accepted for inclusion in Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @Brockport. For more information, please contact kmyers@brockport.edu.

State University of New York - College at Brockport

Department of Biological Sciences

**Guidelines, Standards, and Procedures For
Re-Appointment, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion**



Fall, 2004

.

Overview of Application and Review Process:

The APT processes detailed in this document are informed by and in compliance with the College procedures as embodied in “Procedural Requirements for Academic Personnel Decisions” prepared by the Dean’s Council (8-31-2000) and approved by the Faculty Senate (pending as of 11/6/00.)

1. Role of the APT Committee: The APT Committee is charged with the review of all applications for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion within the Department. The review process will consider the performance of the Candidate with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service as specified in the sections below.

The outcome of the APT Committee review will be an assignment of points for each criterion based on the documentation submitted by the candidate and a written recommendation highlighting the strengths and weakness of the application.

2. Role of the Candidate: Requests by full-time faculty to be considered for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion are to be made in writing to the APT Committee in accordance with current administrative deadlines. It is the responsibility of each individual seeking re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion within the Department to prepare a complete and organized package of materials supporting his/her request. Further, it is the responsibility of each individual to know and understand 1) the terms of his/her current appointment and 2) application deadlines for contract renewal, continuing appointment, and promotion.

3. Application Contents: Materials supporting the Candidate’s request for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion, shall be organized and indexed in accord with any administrative guidelines in effect at the time of the application. The Candidate should strive to ease the burden of those reviewing the Candidate’s request through the use of a clear, concise, and consistent labeling scheme for all supporting documents. Where guidelines do not exist, the following ordering of materials shall be used:

- A letter of no more than two pages summarizing the file, including criteria weights to be applied;
- Inventory of materials submitted;
- Annual reports for the period under review, including comment and signature pages;
- Teaching Portfolio;

- Supporting documents related primarily to scholarship;
- Supporting documents related primarily to service; and
- Other documents and appendices included by the Candidate.

Where possible, materials should be organized into three-ring or equivalent binders that are clearly labeled. A Candidate should not expect individuals reviewing his/her materials to sift through unorganized and loose materials contained in boxes.

4. Criteria to be Considered: The report of the APT Committee will focus on the Candidate's record in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as it pertains to the personnel action under consideration. Any application for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion, must include a statement by the Candidate regarding the relative weights to be applied to the criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service. Each Candidate will select a set of weights such that:

- The weight on teaching is at least 50%;
- The weight on scholarship is at least 30%
- The weight on service is at least 10%
- The remaining 10% may be applied at the discretion of the Candidate.

The Candidate should specify the weight distribution of the three areas in her/his letter of application, **but teaching must be weighted at 50% or higher.** The Candidate's right to specify weights in the review process does not remove the obligation of the Candidate to meet minimal performance standards in teaching, scholarship, and service as described later in this document.

5. Application of Criteria Weights In The Review Process: Members of the APT Committee are charged with applying the weights, as supplied by the Candidate, as they consider the Candidate's request for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion. Each member of the APT Committee is responsible for ensuring that his/her point assignment takes into account the weights specified by the Candidate.

6. Distribution of APT Committee Reports: The APT Committee members are responsible for conducting the review process and preparing the Committee report in conformance with published administrative deadlines.

The report will consist of a compilation of points awarded for each criterion in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service; the report will include a recommendation for tenure or promotion. The written report of the Committee will be shared with Candidate prior to forwarding the report to the Department and Department Chairperson. The only purpose of sharing the report with the Candidate, prior to its being forwarded, is to allow clarification by the Candidate. It is understood that the Candidate has the option of withdrawing his/her request at any time prior to when the Committee presents the report to the Department and

Department Chairperson. The identity of the Candidate who chooses to withdraw his/her request will be kept confidential.

Except in cases where the Candidate chooses to withdraw his/her request for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion, the Committee will submit its written report to the Department and Department Chairperson. All materials will be returned to the Candidate by the appropriate College official or will be retained in the Department office pending disposal.

The Committee's report, the Department vote and the Department Chairperson's written recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean

7. Voting process: After the Department has received the Committee's recommendation, a department meeting will be convened and vote and on the question: "Do the department voting members accept or reject the recommendation of the APT Committee?"

Prior to the vote, the Candidate will have an opportunity to speak to the Department about the Committee's recommendation, and to address the Department as the Candidate sees fit. The Department will also have the opportunity to ask questions of the Candidate. The Candidate will then leave the meeting.

Members of the Department will then have the opportunity (1) to ask questions of the APT Committee and (2) for general discussion. When the Candidate is applying for any personnel action **all tenure track members of the Department will vote by secret ballot. If the Candidate is applying for promotion to Professor, the Professors of the Department will vote by secret ballot.** Neither the Candidate nor the Department Chairperson may vote. The Department Chairperson makes a separate recommendation. The result of the vote will be announced to the Department at the meeting and recorded in the minutes of the meeting. The Department Chairperson's recommendation will be made known to the Department at this time. Immediately following the meeting, at which the vote is taken, the Department Chairperson will meet with the Candidate and inform her/him of the vote result and the Department Chairperson's recommendation. The Chairperson of the APT Committee will write a letter to the Department Chairperson, with a copy to the Candidate, stating the outcome of the vote. The Committee's recommendation, the Department vote, and the Department Chairperson's recommendation will be sent to the Dean, with a copy to the Candidate..

EVALUATION OF CRITERIA FOR TEACHING

A faculty member in the Department of Biological Sciences is expected to develop into an excellent teacher. Excellence is developed over time by exposing students to the best in one's field in intellectually stimulating and demanding, but fair, ways in the classroom, laboratory or field. Achievement of excellence in teaching will be evident in student and peer evaluations of formal teaching, by involving undergraduate and graduate students in research or scholarship, and in the materials and activities developed for teaching.

Teaching is the highest priority for faculty and that is reflected in the fact that it is weighted minimally at 50% of the faculty member's workload. APT-review is of primary importance and will constitute 75% of the weight within the teaching category, with student evaluations representing 25%.

The criteria include classroom, laboratory, and field teaching.

Criteria for Teaching	Score
APT review is weighted 75% for teaching	
Teaching philosophy is consistent with department goals	0-3
Instructor has sufficient expertise in subject matter	0-10
Instructor shows appropriate enthusiasm for teaching subject matter	0-3
Course objectives are clearly presented to students	0-5
Course material is appropriate for course level	0-5
Grading is consistent and fair	0-5
Instructor presents coherent, well-organized classroom lectures, labs and field work	0-15
Instructor is accessible to students	0-2
Instructor is aware of and concerned for individual student progress	0-2
Instructor employs a variety of teaching techniques	0-5
Instructor regularly updates courses	0-10
Instructor develops new courses	0-10
Papers presented by students at meetings, including Scholar's Day	0-2
Instructor develops new course material, e.g. lab manuals, software, etc.	0-5
Independent and directed studies	0-5
MS committees served on	0-10
MS theses completed	0-10
Student evaluations are weighted at 25% for teaching	
Scores on standardized surveys	0-5
Solicited letters	0-1
Unsolicited letters	0-1
Student interviews	0-2

Teaching Expectations: *The expectations specified herein are the minimum required for a positive recommendation. However, achievement of the minimum may not be sufficient for a positive recommendation as other factors may be included in the total evaluation.*

*First reappointment: *(recommendation is due during the second year after appointment according the calendar of personnel acrtions distributed by the Provost's office)* **25 points**

*Second reappointment: *(recommendation is due during the fifth year after appointment according the calendar of personnel acrtions distributed by the Provost's office)* **50 points**

*Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor: *(recommendation is due during the sixth year after appointment according the calendar of personnel acrtions distributed by the Provost's office)* **60 points**

*Promotion to Professor: **75 points**

EVALUATION OF CRITERIA FOR SCHOLARSHIP

The Department expects that scholarship is intended to contribute to the body of knowledge in the biological sciences, keep faculty abreast of recent developments in their field which contributes to their teaching expertise, and educates students in biological research. Therefore, it is expected that faculty will involve students in their scholarly activities and products.

1. Peer-reviewed publications:

Publication of research results in peer-reviewed international/national journals is the standard for scholarship in the biological sciences. The nature and length of publications may vary and that variation must be taken into account in evaluating the articles. Some journals such as Science and Nature do not publish articles much beyond 2-3 pages, yet they are among the most prestigious of journals. Other journals, of a more narrow disciplinary focus, will publish longer articles, e.g. 10-15 pages. At times, a piece of scholarship is too lengthy to be published as a single paper in an appropriate journal and authors may be required to split the scholarship into 2 or more papers. Chapters in scholarly books are considered equivalent to papers. The criteria distinguish between “biology papers done at Brockport,” and “biology papers done at other institutions.” In the first case, the scholarship has been initiated and completed while the Candidate is a Brockport faculty member; it does not mean that the faculty member does not collaborate with colleagues at other institutions. The latter means the work was initiated at an institution other than Brockport, usually the doctoral or postdoctoral institution. Papers that are “in press” and for which the Candidate has a letter from the journal editor stating such are considered published. “Manuscripts in preparation” or “manuscripts submitted” receive no points.

2. Published textbooks/lab manuals

SUNY Brockport, being an institution that considers teaching its highest priority, recognizes the valid role of textbooks/lab manuals as scholarly products if they are published by a reputable publisher. Publication of textbooks/lab manuals by local “publishers” is not regarded as scholarship, but may be considered appropriate to the category of teaching.

3. External Funding

According to the college “GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENT RENEWAL, TENURE (CONTINUING APPOINTMENT), PROMOTION, AND PERFORMANCE AT RANK,” external funding is considered scholarship if it relates “directly to research activity and/or result in a product.” Availability of funding varies considerably in different disciplines in the biological sciences. In some disciplines local/regional funding sources are readily available, but in others only federal sources

such as NIH, NSF, EPA, etc. are available. Faculty at four-year colleges like Brockport are at a disadvantage to faculty from Ph.D.-granting institutions when competing for federal research grants. Therefore, Brockport faculty are encouraged to continue/establish collaborative arrangements with colleagues from Ph.D.-granting institutions to increase the likelihood of external funding. While a minimum amount of funding is not stipulated here, it is expected that the faculty member will secure sufficient funding to support her/his research program.

Taking factors such the above into account, the following scale will quantify scholarship. This scale is based on a weight of at least 30% for scholarship:

Criteria	Points
@Peer-reviewed biology papers from Brockport in national/international journals - Candidate is primary author	10
@Peer-reviewed biology papers from Brockport in national/international journals - Candidate is secondary author	5-8
@Peer-reviewed biology papers from other institutions in national/international journals – Candidate is first author	5
@Peer-reviewed biology papers from other institutions in national/international journals – Candidate is not first author	2-4
@Peer-reviewed biology papers from Brockport in regional journals	1-3
@Peer-reviewed biology papers from other institutions in regional journals	1
@Peer-reviewed teaching papers in national/international journals	2
@Peer-reviewed teaching papers in regional journals	1
@Student(s) as co-authors on papers	2
@Scholarly Books	6
@Chapters in scholarly reviewed books	5
@Published textbooks/lab manuals	4
@Presented papers – international/national conferences	5
@Presented papers – regional/state/local conferences	1
Citations	1-3
@Book reviews	1
@Review grants	1
@Review articles for journals	1
@Technical reports	1
@Editorships	5
@External funding from national agencies	5 -20
@Submission of grant to national agencies	2
@External funding from regional/state/local agencies	5
@SUNY grants	2
International/national Awards	5

Scholarship Expectations (Note that the points for each level are summative, incorporating all prior levels.) . These expectations were established by reviewing the scholarly achievements of current faculty, both for tenure and promotion. It is our expectation that Candidates earning tenure and/or promotion should present credentials comparable to current faculty.

* First reappointment: **10 points**. While no points are awarded for applications for external funding, it is expected that the Candidate will have applied for external funding, beyond that of SUNY grants.

* Second reappointment: **25 points**. By this time it is expected that the Candidate will have an established program of scholarship. Two publications in peer-reviewed international/national journals are required. One (1) of the publications must be from work done at Brockport. Some grant/contract funding is expected by this time, and the Candidate should have presented papers at conferences.

* Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor: **60 points** The Candidate will have at least four papers in peer-reviewed international/national journals, two of which must be from work done at Brockport. The faculty member will have secured sufficient external funding to support her/his research program. Examination of the above scholarly criteria for currently tenured faculty reveals that the achievement ranged from 68 to 141 points.

Sample file for tenure:

2 papers at Brockport as primary author	20 points
3 papers before Brockport -	15
1 National Grant	10
3 national presentations	15
2 SUNY Grants	4
3 local/regional presentations	3
Total	67

* Promotion to Professor: **10+ points since promotion to Associate Professor**. The “GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENT RENEWAL, TENURE (CONTINUING APPOINTMENT), PROMOTION, AND PERFORMANCE AT RANK,” specify that scholarship for promotion to Professor “should be significantly greater than was expected to achieve the rank of Associate Professor.” Examination of the above scholarly criteria for all full professors achieving that rank in the Department since 1984 reveals that the number of points accrued ranged from 116 – 160.

EVALUATION OF UNIVERSITY, PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Standards and Procedures for Evaluating Service. Service has an important role in the academic community. Contributions to the service needs of the Department, the University, one's Profession and the community are ongoing expectations within the total professional obligation.

Criteria for Service	Score
Major advisement	2
Advise at SOAR/SIS/Final registration	1
Serve on departmental committees	1
Advise a departmental club	2
Serve on College-wide committees	2
Chair a departmental committee	3
Serve as Faculty Senator	4
Officer in Regional professional societies	4
Teach an APS section	4
Serve as department chair	6
Chair a College committee	6
Officer in a national professional society	6
Advise governmental or private sector organization	6

Service Expectations (Note that the points for each level are summative, incorporating all prior levels.) These expectations are based on a 9 contact hour per semester teaching load.

***First reappointment: 4 points:** The Candidate is expected to serve on one departmental committee, to advise students and participate in one of the college-wide advisement recruitment sessions. Fulfillment of these service responsibilities will be considered sufficient for reappointment

***Second reappointment: 7 points:** In addition to the responsibilities undertaken during the first reappointment period (4 points), the Candidate will undertake one additional service task demonstrating increasing involvement with college-wide, professional, or community initiatives.

***Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor: 7 points:** Consistent participation in the previous undertakings will be considered sufficient for tenure/promotion to Associate professor.

*Promotion to Professor: **13 points:** Excellence in contributions to service responsibilities and significance of the service undertakings at this level are the hallmarks of the individual attaining a Professorship.

The following table summarizes the minimum point level required for positive personnel recommendations. In addition the Candidate must specify where the remaining 10% is to be applied and the minimum level for a positive recommendation will be adjusted. For example, if the 10% is to be added to scholarship for the tenure decision, then the number of points would increase from 60 to 66.

Personnel Action	Teaching Points	Scholarship Points	Service Points
First Reappointment	25	10	4
Second Reappointment	50	25	7
Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor	60	60	7
Promotion to Professor	75	100	13

Note that the points in each category, i.e., teaching, scholarship and service are independent of each other and should not be compared.

Finally, every faculty member is expected to continue a pattern of productivity appropriate to rank for his/her entire professional career as a Brockport faculty member. Each faculty member is expected to teach, conduct research and perform service at the level expected for his her rank as outlined above in this document. Faculty who do not meet the expectation in scholarship will normally be given an additional teaching assignment.